

**AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS**

The two attached replacement sheets of drawings include changes to Fig(s). 3 and 6. The first replacement sheet, which includes Fig(s). 1, 2, 3 and 5, replaces the original sheet including Fig(s). 1, 2, 3 and 5. The second replacement sheet, which includes Fig. 6, replaces the original sheet including Fig. 6. Annotated sheets showing the changes are also attached to show the changes made by this Amendment.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet

Annotated Sheet Showing Changes(s)

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

By this Amendment, the specification, abstract and drawings are amended, claims 8-10 are canceled and claims 1 and 6 are amended. Claims 1-7 are pending.

Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Applicants gratefully acknowledge the statement in the Office Action at Paragraphs 10-11 that claims 1-7 would be allowable if amended to overcome the objections and Section 112 rejections. For the reasons discussed below, Applicants respectfully submit that the application has been placed in proper form for allowance.

#### **Drawing Objections**

Fig. 3 is amended to replace the duplicate reference number 10 with reference number 13. Fig 6 is amended to replace the “J” (an abbreviation for the German word “Ja” meaning yes) with a “Y” for yes.

The symbols located under the term “MAX” in steps S105 and S106 are not amended, because they are defined in the specification. The symbol “f” represents the frequency (page 8, line 15), the symbol “ $v_0$ ” represents chip offset (page 8, line 16) the symbol “ $\Delta f$ ” represents frequency offset (page 6, line 4). The tilde symbol, which appears above the “ $\Delta f$ ” in steps S105 of Fig. 6, is used to signify that the frequency offset is approximate.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the drawing objections are respectfully requested.

#### **Specification Objections**

The Abstract is amended to obviate the objection related thereto.

The cited passages on pages 2, 3 and 4 of the specification are amended to obviate the objections related thereto.

The expression “r(v)” at page 5, line 10, is amended to read “r(v)” to obviate the objection relating thereto.

The expression “in an” at page 7, line 19 is amended to read “in a” to obviate the objection relating thereto.

Equation (6) at page 5 and Equation (11) at page 7 are not amended. The expression “BurstStartIndex” in the equations is clear enough for the ordinarily skilled artisan (and the

Examiner) to understand that it refers to a “burst start index”. Spaces are unnecessary to understand the expression, particularly in view of the description immediately preceding the Equation (6) at page 5, lines 24-25. Applicants note that they are entitled to coin novel terms in describing their invention. As noted in, e.g., MPEP 2111.01, “An applicant is entitled to be his or her own lexicographer.”

The notations  $v_0$  and  $f$  under the terms “MAX” and “MAXINDEX” are defined in the specification, as noted above with respect to the drawing amendments, and need not be further defined in the equations.

Line 19 of page 7 is a fully justified line followed by an equation. The words on the line are one space apart, but the spaces are expanded to occupy the entire line. Applicants are unaware of any prohibitions against full justification formatting, so the line remains as originally filed.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the specification objections are respectfully requested.

#### Claim Objections

Claims 1 and 6 are amended to obviate the claim objections.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the claim objections are respectfully requested.

#### Claim Rejections

The rejection of claims 8-10 as allegedly lacking enablement under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, is obviated by the cancellation of claims 8-10. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

The rejection of claims 1-10 as allegedly being indefinite under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph is respectfully traversed.

There are three stated grounds for the rejection, which will be addressed in turn.

First, the notation “ $v$ ” is defined in the specification at, e.g., page 5, line 5, as the chip index, and need not be defined again in the claims.

Second, the expression  $N_{FFT}^{-1}$  is defined in claim 3 as a length of a discrete Fourier Transform.

Third, the cancellation of claim 8 obviates the rejection related thereto.

Application No. 10/676,559  
Amendment Dated 3/14/2007  
Reply to Office Action of 1/10/2007

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the indefiniteness rejection are respectfully requested.

For at least the reasons set forth above, it is respectfully submitted that the above-identified application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of the claims are respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further is desirable in order to place the application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

CAESAR, RIVISE, BERNSTEIN,  
COHEN & POKOTILOW, LTD.

By 

David M. Tener  
Registration No. 37,054  
Customer No. 03000  
(215) 567-2010  
Attorneys for Applicants

March 14, 2007

Please charge or credit our Account No. 03-0075 as necessary to effect entry and/or ensure consideration of this submission.
---